

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheet makes changes to Fig. 20 and replaces the original sheet with Fig. 20.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 3-9 and 14 are withdrawn.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 11-13 and 15 are amended to further clarify the subject matter therein, and Fig. 20 is amended to add "Related Art" to the legend. No new matter is added by this Amendment.

I. Drawings

The Office Action suggest that Figure 20 be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated.

Applicants amend Figure 20 to include "Related Art" in the legend. Applicants submit that the requirements of the Patent Office have been met.

II. Claim Objection

Claim 1 is objected to for containing features that are contradictory. Claim 1 is amended to remove the contradictory feature. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is requested.

III. The Pending Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,576,859 (Castleberry); and claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over various combinations of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0113936 (Yanagawa), U.S. Patent No. 6,275,280 (Kajita), and Japanese Patent Publication 2002/341329 (Ota). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action cites Figs. 4 and 5; col. 4, lines 60-62; and col. 5, lines 36-42 of Castleberry and asserts that Castleberry discloses the first substrate, the second substrate, the plurality of scanning lines and plurality of data lines formed on the first substrate, the first lighting shield, the projecting patterns, the electro-optic material filled between the first and second substrates, the second light shielding layers, and the transmissive areas and reflective areas, as recited in claims 11 and 15.

However, Castleberry fails to disclose the feature of the projecting patterns being formed such that all or part of each of the projecting patterns overlaps the corresponding data line and at least one of the corresponding scanning line, capacitive line, and an area surrounded by the corresponding scanning line, data line, and capacitive line. Instead, Castleberry discloses the projecting pattern in the vicinity of the cross points of the data line and the scanning line. These projecting patterns formed on the TFT are not clearly shown in Fig. 4 of Castleberry. Accordingly, the position and figure of projecting patterns according to Castleberry are not known.

In addition, although the Office Action asserts that Yanagawa discloses the projecting patterns being formed so as to overlap the corresponding data line, nowhere does Yanagawa disclose the feature of the projecting patterns being formed such that all or part of each of the projecting patterns overlaps the corresponding data line and at least one of the corresponding scanning line, capacitive line, and an area surrounded by the corresponding scanning line, data line and capacitive line, as recited in each of claims 1, 11-13 and 15. Instead, Yanagawa discloses the projecting pattern on the drain line (Y direction) or gate line (X direction). However, the projecting pattern of Yanagawa is far from a TFT.

Furthermore, Yanagawa and Ota disclose the light-shielding layer forming widely on the downside of the rubbing direction, and Kajita discloses LCD pixels comprising blue color filters with a projecting pattern. However, the position to form the projecting patterns are not clear and are not defined by either Yanagawa, Ota or Kajita. Accordingly, each of Castleberry, Yanagawa, Kajita and Ota fail to clearly disclose, teach or suggest the area forming projecting patterns. That is, Castleberry and/or Yanagawa, whether taken alone or with various combinations of Kajita and Ota, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the projecting patterns being formed such that all or part of each of the projecting patterns overlap the corresponding data line and at least one of the corresponding scanning line,

capacitive line, and an area surrounded by the corresponding scanning line, data line and capacitive line, as recited in each of claims 1, 11-13 and 15.

Accordingly claims 1, 11-13 and 15, as well as the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Castleberry, Yanagawa, Kajita and Ota, whether each is taken alone or in any combination.

Claims 2, 10 and 16 depend from claim 1. Thus, these claims are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and for the additional novel features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/eks

Attachment:
Replacement Sheet

Date: October 24, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461